

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-10, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,946,386 issued to Rogers et al (*Rogers*). Claims 26 and 28-30 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot. The applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 3-10, and 21-25 and 27 are not obvious in view of *Rogers* for at least the reasons described below.

Independent claim 1 recites a computer telephony server comprising, in part, the following:

means for communicating with at least one of the computer telephony applications using a message structure set which is independent of any particular telephony environment;

means for dynamically configuring said server to communicate with said telephony environments using message structure sets each corresponding to a particular one of said telephony environments;

Claims 6, 8, and 27 recite similar limitations.

Rogers discloses a call management system with call control from user workstation computers. Specifically, *Rogers* states that a call management computer is “configured and programmed to appear to telephone service providers as though it is a business PBX or other business telephone switch and/or an Internet or other data server or node.” Column 7, lines 44-47. Incoming calls are detected and control signals are applied to determine the appropriate interface through which to route the calls. See column 9, line 54 – column 10, line 13. Calls are then routed and connected to a system user based on the type of trunk and/or circuit needed. See column 10, lines 14 – 46.

Each different type of call (voice, fax, data, etc.) must be routed to the appropriate type of trunk and/or circuit to establish a connection to the system. Thus, the routing procedure in *Rogers* is dependent on the telephony environment (e.g. voice, fax, data, etc.) being used.

In contrast, claim 1 is directed to a server comprising **means for communicating with at least one of the computer telephony applications using a message structure set which is independent of any particular telephony environment**. *Rogers* does not teach or disclose means for communicating with at least one of the computer telephony applications using a message structure set which is independent of any particular telephony environment. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is not anticipated by *Rogers*. Claims 6, 8, and 27 recite similar limitations. Therefore, the applicant submits that claims 6, 8, and 27 are not anticipated by *Rogers*.

Claims 3-5, 7, 9, 10, and 21-25 depend from claims 1, 6, and 8, respectively. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the applicant submits that *Rogers* does not anticipate claims 3-5, 7, 9, 10, and 21-25.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 31-38 have been added. Independent claim 31 recites limitations similar to those of claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above in regards to claim 1, applicant submits that claim 31 is not anticipated by *Rogers*. Given that claims 32-35 depend from claim 31, applicant submits that claims 32-35 are not anticipated by *Rogers*.

Independent claim 36 is directed to a method of interfacing a plurality of telecommunications environments with a computer telephony server. The method recites, in part, the following:

receiving messages from a telecommunications environment according to a message structure specific to the environment;
translating the received messages according to a second message structure; and
forwarding the translated messages to one of a plurality of computer telephony applications that operate according to the second message structure;

Applicant respectfully submits that *Rogers* does not teach or disclose all of the limitations of claim 36. For example, Applicant submits that *Rogers* does not teach or disclose translating received messages according to a second message structure, as claimed in claim 36. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 36 is not anticipated by *Rogers*.

Claims 37-38 depend from claim 36. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 37-38 are not anticipated by *Rogers*.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 3-10, 21-25, 27 and 31-38 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Applicant has included a copy of all claims in the attached index for the Examiner's convenience.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account
number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 10/1/04



Gregory D. Caldwell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,926

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778

GDC/jse